



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"a counterfeit coin" put into circulation, escaping detection only so long as it escaped examination. They had pressed this point admirably. And it was one to tell upon an intelligent and excitable people. He therefore soon felt that to tie them in the bond of the "Church's authority" was to try and condense air in an India-rubber ball with a flaw in the surface, which would, if further pressed, soon become a rent. They were now beginning to examine arguments before they ventured upon using them. The ground of his most serious apprehension was, however, the rector of the parish. Not, in the slightest degree, doubting the truth of his religion, and assured that it rested upon proofs always forthcoming when required (though, when thinking at times over them, he was not a little disquieted to find how much he had hitherto taken the whole subject upon trust), the good priest, if left to his own temperament and option, would, at once, have committed the whole matter to the issue of a personal controversy. From this he was prohibited by his superiors, who, having far less honesty, though far more wisdom than himself, well knew that the danger to their faith arising from the incitement to the spirit of discussion produced by a successful result, would far outweigh the good to be expected by any single victory, even though that might be anticipated. Which, judging from the adversary to be encountered, it certainly, in this case, could not.

The rector of the parish had been, he was aware, watching with deep anxiety the effect of his recent experiment upon the obedience of his flock. When its failure, which both of them anticipated, became apparent, he knew enough of "the parson" to dread that he would, like "the great Duke," "fix a mistake" of his adversary with the speed and power of a thunderbolt. In fact, this gentleman's whole deportment, since he came into the parish, filled him with most serious apprehension. Not as yet mingling in open controversy, he had nevertheless directed every movement with consummate skill. Thoroughly conversant both with the nature of the human mind, and with the principles and power of the Roman Catholic creed he had, in directing the advances of his Scripture-readers, acted on the valuable principle that, with most people at least, the admission of doctrines does not mainly depend on the strength of the evidence which may be offered for them, or in the ability by which they might be enforced. He was well aware, that, with uneducated people especially, prejudice, preoccupation, habit, and authority mainly effect, if they do not wholly produce, their belief. "Do not be surprised, and never be impatient," he used constantly to tell his Scripture-readers, "if arguments which you see to be perfectly good, fail of obtaining even attention from your Roman Catholic neighbours. Remember that your minds and theirs are in a different condition. Do not therefore be either discouraged or annoyed if your reasons fail, for a time, to produce any effect. The reception of truth, like the growth of the seed, to which it is compared by our blessed Lord, depends on the nature of the soil whereon it has fallen. Your first efforts should, then, be directed to overcome, by patience and gentleness, those obstacles which prevent truth from having a fair hearing. You will have good reason to hope for success when you can get inside prejudices."

"Father M.," he said, "is an able man; I do not think he will now rest without using every effort to defeat our work, which has, I am thankful to know, advanced so far as to warrant us also in taking a more determined front. This we shall do now; for the time has come. I do not consider it would be so wise in me to propose a personal controversy with him, as to wait a little, until, as I hope, his own people may begin to desire this, and press for it. Try to produce and encourage this feeling. I shall, I trust, be ready at any time. I think, however, it will not come to such an issue, until he shall first try to counteract your purposes by the introduction of 'the lay agency,' which his church so largely employs. He will get trained men to go about from house to house. You must be prepared for them. I shall do all in my power to aid you, and, for that purpose, I have drawn up some 'Cautions on Controversy,' which you shall soon have. I must, however, wait for Father M. to develop his plans a little, before I determine on my own. Though I think I can give a good guess as to his future operations."

He did guess, and he was right. The priest threw himself at once into the work. He selected men whom he thought most likely to cope with the Scripture-readers, and taxed himself to the utmost to fit them for their task. He constantly addressed his flock from the altar upon controversial subjects, and adjusted his arguments with much skill to their capacities. He soon saw, that what was plausible told better than what was true. And one piece of ingenuity made a great impression upon his eager hearers. He had been forced to use every effort to dissuade the people from controversy. So he thus addressed them:—

"Are you not all sure of the truths of our most holy faith. Has not the holy Catholic Church, which can never err, told you what they are? What, then, do you want with controversy—can it make you more sure? You might as well say I want the help of a farthing candle when you have the full light of God's blessed sun to see by. The Church is the sun, and controversy is the farthing candle. Moreover—to dispute is to doubt. Do

you doubt? My friends, I must warn you, that the very moment you doubt, you cease to be a Catholic, because there is no doubt in the Catholic Church. So you become a heretic; and you well know what becomes of heretics. Leave controversy, then, to those who have difficulties to settle. You have none. Have, therefore, nothing to do with it. It lets down your religion. Would you demean it before the very people who are doing their best to pull it down? Let it alone, for controversy implies doubt, and doubt is heresy, and heresy ruins you body and soul."

This address took mightily with the listeners; for it touched their pride, pleased their fancy, and awakened their fears. It was thought so good, that unfortunately it defeated its object. For the schoolmaster, an uncommonly smart fellow, who had many a hard battle with our young friend, the Scripture-reader, met him a day or two after, and being as proud of this new idea as a little boy of his first jacket and trousers, he determined to try what he professionally termed "the priest's crux" upon him. And so, having given the argument with his own embellishments, he cried out, rather triumphantly, "I should like to hear now, Mr. Scripture-reader, what you can say to this?"

The other smiled good-humouredly. His questioner not seeing him to be taken aback as much as he had expected by the difficulty, asked him rather sharply why he laughed.

"Well," said the other, "if you won't be angry, I will tell you. I was once made a great fool of."

"I dare say you were," said the schoolmaster, who owed him a hit, and very much wished he could make a fool of him just then—"But how was it?"

"When I was a youngster I went, with other little boys, to see a show of which we had heard a great deal. There was a man standing outside the entrance door, holding up a doll's house, very nicely painted, and crying out 'step in, ladies and gentlemen, you will see a pair of the most wonderful dwarfs in the world. This is, as you see, the house they live in.'"

"Well," said the other, observing him to pause, "what then?"

"Why," looking hard at him, "I was fool enough to believe him."

THE SEE OF ST. PETER.—No. II.

In our last number we furnished our readers with some of our reasons for believing that St. Peter was never Bishop of Rome, and pointed out some of the difficulties in the way of those who would maintain the contrary proposition.

We would now request their attention to a few further observations upon this extremely important subject.

That we do not exaggerate the importance of it might easily be shown from the writings of the most celebrated Roman Catholic controversialists. We think, however, we need not go further than the celebrated Cardinal Ballarmino, who unequivocally confesses it when he says that "the right of the Popes has its foundation in the fact that St. Peter established his seat at Rome by divine command, and that he occupied it till his death."

If St. Peter was ever really Bishop of Rome, it surely would not be unreasonable to ask when he became so, and how long he occupied that See.

We need scarcely say that the Holy Scriptures contain no allusion whatever to St. Peter having ever been at Rome, while the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles are full of allusions and statements as to St. Paul having for several years resided at Rome, and taken an active personal part in preaching the Gospel in that city.

St. Peter himself wrote two general Epistles, which have been preserved as part of the sacred canon, and received alike as true by both Roman Catholics and Protestants. In both he calls himself an *Apostle of Jesus Christ*, but makes no allusion whatever to his being Bishop of Rome. Is it not difficult to believe that he would have been thus silent if he was, in fact, such bishop, and the whole fabric of the Church was for all after times to be based upon that very fact, as its great foundation?

Surely, then, it is incumbent on those who assert that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome to tell us when he became so, and how long he held that office; and, in a point so important, we think that we might fairly expect that all Roman Catholic writers would be unanimous (if the much-boasted unity of the Church of Rome really exists in anything but in name), and that no second opinion could exist about it.

We are about to show, however, that there is no point less settled among her learned men, and that it is hopeless to get from them any answer to our question on which it is possible to rely with the slightest degree of confidence. Some think that St. Peter first visited Rome, and commenced his apostolic or episcopal functions there, A.D. 42, in the second year of the Emperor Claudius; others, that he never was at Rome until A.D. 54, in the reign of Nero; and some think A.D. 65, in which year he is stated to have been put to death there as a martyr.

Up to the time of the Reformation we believe the uniformly received account was that St. Peter went to Rome

"Jus successionis pontificum Romanorum in eo fundatur quod Petrus sedem suam jubente Domino collocaverit, atque ibidem usque ad mortem sederit."—De Rom. Pontifice, lib. II., c. i., p. 136, Col. 1636.

in the second year of Claudius, and remained there as Bishop for twenty-five years. At a time when the Holy Scriptures were little read by either clergy or laity, the utter incompatability of such a statement with the Scriptural narrative remained unobserved and unchallenged; and if any one required evidence of a matter considered so fundamental, he would probably have been considered to be satisfactorily and fully answered by a passage from what is called the *Chronicon of Eusebius*, which we alluded to in our last number, p. 85, note; or to the *Liberian Catalogue*, first published by Father Bucher in 1634, as to which we shall have to say a few words presently.

We believe few scholars would, at the present day, venture to rely on either of those documents as worthy of unqualified credit, but we shall, perhaps, save trouble to some of our readers, and prevent others from being misled by high sounding titles, if (even at the risk of seeming tedious to those who are already satisfied by the authorities cited in our former article) we proceed to lay before them, as briefly and distinctly as we can, the result of a somewhat laborious and, we believe, accurate inquiry into those often quoted passages—quoted, too, we are sorry to say, by writers who were, or ought to have been, fully aware of their doubtfulness, though they rely on them with as much confidence as if they were authorities of the highest weight and undoubted character.

The "Chronicon of Eusebius" was a work written in Greek, which has been long since lost, and all we have at present is a Latin work, attributed, we believe correctly, to St. Jerome, partly taken from the original of Eusebius, but which appears to have been not so much a translation as a compilation, somewhat hastily made, from a variety of authors, of whom Eusebius was one, but of others of whom we do not even know the names.

It is not easy, for reasons which we shall hereafter state, to give the words of St. Jerome with any reasonable degree of certainty; the discrepancy indeed is so great between different MSS. and editions, that it is nearly impossible to know which of the readings is really the correct one. We shall presently give some specimens of the discrepancies referred to; at present we shall merely state, that the substance of the passage is this, that "in the second year of the reign of Claudius (A.D. 42), Peter, having first founded the See of Antioch, went to Rome, where he remained as Bishop, preaching the Gospel for twenty-five years;" or, as Father Bucher's old Roman Catalogue expresses it, with more specific particularity, "twenty-five years one month and nine days!"

That this statement is wholly at variance with the truth of history, nobody now doubts, and Dr. Dollinger, a high authority at present in the Roman Catholic world, in his "Beginnings of Christianity," vol. i., p. 72, goes so far as to say (we think, rather rashly): "As for a continuous residence of St. Peter of twenty-five years' duration at Rome, that never was maintained by any person whatever." If what Dr. Dollinger means here by this, perhaps *designedly*, ambiguous language is, that no one ever maintained that St. Peter never was absent for a month from Rome for the twenty-five years that he is stated to have been Bishop there, no doubt what he says is true—no one ever did, we believe, make any such absurd assertion. But if he means that no one ever maintained that St. Peter resided at Rome for twenty-five years as its Bishop, his statement is wholly erroneous, as no one who treated the statement in the *Chronicon* of Jerome as accurate ever maintained anything else, until Baronius first started the theory that St. Peter paid two visits to Rome, one in the second year of Claudius, and the second shortly before his martyrdom, twenty-five years afterwards, in the reign of Nero. We refer, however, to Dr. Dollinger, merely to show that Roman Catholics at present have given up the old theory of St. Peter having been twenty-five years resident as Bishop of Rome, and, therefore, so far, have given up the testimony of Jerome's *Chronicon* and the *Liberian Catalogue*.

We now proceed to show what the most learned Roman Catholic writers of the 17th and 18th centuries have written upon this subject.

The eminent Father Ceillier, in his *General History of Sacred Authors*, vol. I. p. 434, says—"St. Peter came to Rome in the commencement of the reign of Nero, the 54th year of Jesus Christ, according to the common era. I know that several able men distinguish between two journeys of St. Peter to Rome, and that they fix the first in the 2nd year of the reign of Claudius, which was the 42nd year of Jesus Christ. They support this statement on the testimony of Eusebius, of St. Jerome, and of an ancient Catalogue of the Roman Pontiffs published by Father Bucher. These authors, in effect, say that the Prince of the Apostles, after having governed the Church of Antioch, and preached the Gospel to the Jews dispersed throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, came to Rome, in the 2nd year of the Emperor Claudius, to combat Simon the Magician, and that he held his see there for the space of 25 years, until the 14th year of Nero, which was also the last of his reign. But it is not, perhaps, very difficult to show that in that Eusebius and St. Jerome were far apart from the truth of history, which they had not sufficiently examined. 1st, It appears by the book of the Acts of the Apostles, that until the death of Herod Agrippa, which happened the same year that he put St. Peter into prison, that Apostle never preached the Gospel in any other country but Judea and Syria. Then Josephus informs us

that Herod Agrippa died in the 4th year of the Empire of Claudius. St. Peter could not, then, have come to Rome in the 2nd year of the reign of that prince. 2ndly, Apollonius, an ancient writer, who flourished in the reign of Commodus, says, that he had learned from an old tradition, that Jesus Christ had forbidden his Apostles to leave Jerusalem for twelve years.^b He did not, therefore, believe any more than the ancient Jews from whom he had learned the circumstance, that St. Peter had made a journey to Rome in the 2nd year of Claudius, since the 12th year from the death of Jesus Christ was in the 5th year of that Emperor. 3rdly, The author of a treatise written about the year 314, and which is attributed to Lactantius (*de moribus Persecutorum*, ch. 2), says, in express terms, that the Apostles employed the 25 years which followed the death of Jesus Christ in preaching the Gospel in the different provinces of the world; but that Nero having ascended the throne of the Empire, St. Peter came to Rome, and there founded that Church. This author thus knew of but one journey of St. Peter to Rome; and a learned man of the last century conjectures, with much appearance of truth, that the opinion which for some time prevailed about St. Peter having governed the Church of Rome during twenty-five years, arose from having confounded the twenty-five years which the Apostles employed, each separately, in proclaiming the Gospel throughout the whole world with the time that St. Peter governed the Church of Rome by himself; and this writer (Stephen Baluze) has no hesitation in abandoning, upon this point, Eusebius and St. Jerome, to adopt the opinion of Lactantius, who admitted but one journey of St. Peter to Rome, and who places it, not in the reign of Claudius, but under that of Nero. This, also, is the view that I adopt.^c

The writer alluded to in the above passage by Father Ceillier, Stephen Baluze, was the learned librarian of Colbert, the minister of Louis XIV., who published the treatise, "*De moribus Persecutorum*," attributed (whether correctly or not) to Lactantius, in the year 1679. He, though a decided Roman Catholic, rejects the story, as absurd, that St. Peter went twice to Rome to combat Simon Magus—a thing recorded, he says, in no ancient author. It is unnecessary to trouble our unlearned readers with all that Baluze says on the subject; but, for the satisfaction and convenience of our more learned readers, we subjoin the whole passage in the note, in the end of which will be seen how anxious he was to support the authority of the Roman Pontiff, even while obliged, by the truth of history, to give up one of the props by which that authority had theretofore been maintained.^d

While Baluze, however, thus gave up the fact supposed to be asserted by Eusebius and Jerome, and endeavoured to substitute, as an equivalent and sufficient support, the supposed facts, that Peter in person placed his see at Rome (of which he gives no proof whatever), and that he confirmed it by his blood (i.e., by suffering martyrdom there), he overlooks the fact, that we have no better proof of his having been Bishop of Rome at all than we have of his having been there for 25 years, and seems to forget that a person may suffer martyrdom in a place without having ever been Bishop of it.

The next writer we must mention is the same Henry de Valois (Valesius), the learned commentator on the History of Eusebius, whom we mentioned already in our former article (page 85), and who, in his commentary on Eusebius, incidentally to the date of St. Mark going to Egypt, assigns his reasons for differing from the date assigned for St. Peter's visit to Rome in the Chronicon of Eusebius. We need not repeat them here, as they are pretty much what we have already given in the passage cited from Ceillier. We, however, subjoin the passage in full, for the satisfaction of our learned readers, in a note.^e

^b The statement of Apollonius is recorded by Eusebius in his history—"Apollonius tanquam ex veterum traditione hæc refert, Dominum Apostolis suis præcepisse ne intra duodecim annis Hierosolymam excederent."—Euseb. Hist. book 5, cap. 18.

^c Histoire Generale des Auteurs Sacrés et Ecclesiastiques par R. P. Dom. Reiny Ceillier, Benedictin, tom. i. p. 434. Paris, 1729.

^d Steph. Baluzii, Miscell., lib. ii. Paris, 1679. Note ad Lactantium, p. 354.

^e Per annos, xxv.—Ait Lactantius Apostolos, et in his Mattheam et Paulum, qui post mortem Christi Domini reliquis adjuncti fuerant, evangelium per omnem terram prædicavisse per annos xxv. usque ad principium Neroniani imperii, et Petrum Romam profectum quum Nero illic imperaret. Et hæc quidem fuisse tum communem de Petri ad urbem Romam profectione opinionem, tamen est aliter post nonnullos veteres senserit Eusebius, valde probabilis est, cum Lactantius nullam de ea re controversiam moveat.—Fortassis ergo ex his viginti quinque annis, qui ad prædicationem omnium Apostolorum ex æquo pertinet, orta est opinio de 25 annis quos quidam vix eres et lunare meritis recentiorum agmen Sancto Petro Apostolo tribuunt. In Sede Romana. Nam licet frustra ac supervacaneè nonnullis negari putem adventum ejus ad urbem Romam, qui clarissimæ veterum testimonio comprobatur est, de tempore tamen multum ambigo, cum videam tot tantasque diffinitas habere eorum sententiam qui illum Romam venisse volunt Claudio imperante, ut coacti sint duplicare profectionem ejus in urbem, et duplex item ejus cum Simone Magi certamen comminisci, primo quidem temporibus Claudii, dein principatu Neronis. Quæ res quæ absurda sit, cum id a nullo veterum proditum sit memoriam literarum pervenire istarum rerum perit. Nam quod à recentioribus auctore sine alioquin vetustioris auctoritate profectum committitur, ut monuit illu-rrissimus Cardinalis Baronius. Itaque si hæc esset recedere a vulgari et in animis hominum iusta opinio, ei Lactantianum lubenter præferrem, id est, Petrum quidem Romam prædicasse evangelium facile concederem, non sub Tiberio Claudio ut vulgò putant, sed sub Nerone Claudio. Quippe stabilita semel hæc veritas, ut puto, sententia, conquiescit sustinet omnis disputatio absque ullo incommodo auctoritatis Romanæ Pontificis. Neque enim longa annorum series, quibus Petrus fuerit episcopus Romæ, primatum illius Ecclesiæ stabilita, sed perenne Petri qui cathedram suam ibi collocavit, et eam suo sanguine solidavit ac confirmavit.

^f Henr. Valesius, ad Eusebii Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. c. xvi (Paris, 1659—

The next writer we shall refer to on this point is the celebrated Father Antonio Pagi (a Franciscan monk), the most learned and candid of Baronius's commentators, who repeats expressly the views and arguments of Valesius and Baluze, which he approves, and adopts in detail, adding that Father Papebroche, the learned Jesuit, and Ludovicus de Four in his annotations on the Pontifical chronology, both held the same opinion.^f

The Dominican Fathers, in their Bibliothéque Sacrée (art. Antioch), treat the matter as now quite determined, and say, "What is certain is, that Peter did not go to Rome until the reign of Nero." (Ce qu'il y a de certain c'est qu'il n'alla à Rome que sous l'Empire de Nero.)

After such a phalanx of eminent Roman Catholic writers, it would be difficult to suppose any one bold enough at the present day to uphold the proposition that St. Peter was for 25 years Bishop of Rome; but it may be right to look a little more fully into the question, what weight ought, in fairness, irrespective of the authority of the above learned Roman Catholic critics, to be attached to the disputed Chronicon of Eusebius, in which it is stated that this assertion appears.

Eusebius was Archbishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, and wrote a History of the Church in Greek (A.D. 340), in which he tells us (Lib. iii. 31) that he gives us all the facts that had come down to his time respecting the Apostles and their times. This History has come down to us entire, and is, we admit, of the highest authority.

The Chronicon of Eusebius is admitted on all hands to have been written before his History, and was a chronological synopsis, and also written in Greek, as all Eusebius's works were.

Unfortunately, the Greek text of this work is lost, though the learned Joseph Scaliger used great industry to restore it, by collecting from Cedrenus and Syncellus and other works, what he supposes to be fragments of the original Greek of Eusebius.

We may, perhaps, as well add here that, in this fragmentary restoration of the Greek Chronicon of Eusebius, by Scaliger, there is no passage answering to the Latin one relied on,^g nor has any such passage ever been produced, though Dr. Cave, in his Historia Literaria, a century and a half ago, challenged the Roman Catholic clergy to produce Greek words to the effect in question.

The work which now passes commonly under the title

annot., p. 33) de S. Marci in Ægyptum profectionis ad Evangelium prædicandum anno dicti, non satis inter antiquos scriptores constare. — Sed si verum est id quod Clemens et Apollonius retulerunt, Marcum una cum Petro venisse Romam, ibique rogatum a Romanis Evangelium conscribere; priusquam de tempore profectionis Marci in Ægyptum dicamus, inquirendum est, quo anno Petrus in urbem Romanam advenit. Eusebius quidem in Chronico, Petri in urbem Romanam adventum refert anno secundo Claudii Augusti, quam sententiam secutus est Baronius et Petavius, alique plures. Sed hæc sententia refelli videtur ex Actibus Apostolorum; ex quibus constat Petrum in Judæa ac Syria semper mansisse usque ad ultimum annum Agrippæ regis. Qui cum Hierosolymis Petrum in vincula conjecisset, paulo post, divinæ eum insequente justitiæ, exstinctus est Cæsareæ, ut refert Lucas. Cum igitur anno quarto Claudii mortuussit Agrippa, ut inter omnes convenit, Petrus ante hunc annum Romam profectus non potuit. Hanc opinionem valde confirmat Apollonius vetus scriptor, qui adversus Montani hæresim inculcans voluminibus decertavit. Is scribit se ex traditione majorum ita accepisse, Apostolos post duodecimum ab Ascensione Domini annum a se invicem discessisse, cum Christus ita ipsis præcepisset. Verba Apollonii habentur Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Eusebii nostri lib. 5. cap. 18. Idem refert Beda in cap. 13. Actuum Apostolorum. Sed Auctor Chronici Alexandrini adventum Petri in urbem Romam adhuc tardius refert. Scribit enim Paulum venisse Hierosolyma, ob controversiam de circumsione, anno sexto Claudii; eoque anno celebratum esse Concilium Hierosolymitanum, Apostolis nondum a se invicem disjunctis. Itaque ex ejus sententiâ, Petrus non ante annum septimum Claudii Romam profectus est. Sed delendum est, quod in eo Chronico vixit circiter annorum lacuna est. Ita Marcus anno Claudii non Alexandri profectus fuit: quæ est sententia Eutychii Patriarchæ Alexandrini.

^f Critica in Annales Baronii. Ant. Pagi. Ord. Franc. Paris, 1689 p. 39. A.D. 43. See Baron. 45. Claudii Imp. 3., Cons. Claudius Aug. III., et L. Vitellius II.

^g Ad num. I. Eusebius in Chronico, Petri in urbem Romam adventum refert anno secundo Claudii, quam sententiam secutus est Baronius. Sed ut inquit Valesius in notis ad Eusebium lib. 2. c. 16. sententia hæc refelli videtur ex Actibus Apostolorum; ex quibus constat, Petrum in Judæa ac Syria semper mansisse usque ad ultimum annum Agrippæ regis. Qui cum Hierosolymis Petrum in vincula conjecisset, paulo post, divinæ eum insequente justitiæ exstinctus est Cæsareæ, ut refert Lucas. Cum igitur anno quarto Claudii mortuussit Agrippa, ut inter omnes convenit, Petrus ante hunc annum Romam profectus non potuit. Sed auctor Chronici Alexandrini adventum Petri in urbem Romam adhuc tardius refert. Scribit enim Paulum venisse Hierosolyma ob controversiam de circumsione, anno sexto Claudii; eoque anno celebratum esse Concilium Hierosolymitanum, Apostolis nondum a se invicem disjunctis. Itaque ex ejus sententiâ Petrus non ante annum septimum Claudii Romam profectus est. Denique Lactantius libri de Moribus Persecutorum capite secundo, ait, Petrum cum jam Nero imperaret, Romam venisse quo opinio vero similior videtur. Neque enim in Chronologia Pontificia Eusebio magna fides habenda; ut inferius ostendimus.

^h Præstat hic Lactantii citati verba in medium afferre. Apostoli per annos xxv. usque ad principium Neroniani Imperii per omnes Provincias et civitates Ecclesiæ fundamenta miserunt. Cumque jam Nero imperaret Petrus Romam advenit, et edidit quibusdam miraculis, quæ virtute ipsius Dei data sibi ab eo potestate faciebant, convertit multos ad iudicium, Deoque tenipum fidele ac stabile posuit. Ex his viginti quinque annis qui ad prædicationem omnium Apostolorum ex æquo pertinet, orta videtur opinio de xxv. annis, qui vulgo tribuuntur S. Petro in sede Romana. Qui Claudio imperante Petrus Romam venisse volunt, cogunt duplicare profectionem ejus in urbem, et duplex item ejus cum Simone Magi certamen comminisci, primo quidem temporibus Claudii, dein principatu Neronis; quod tamen a nullo veterum proditum, ut ait Baluzius in Notis ad Lactantium. Hanc etiam sententiam tuerentur Papebrocius in Coactu Chronico-Historico ad Catalogum veterum Pontificum, et Ludovicus de Four in observationibus MSS. ad Chronologiam Pontificiam, quas meum pro sua benevolentia communicavit.

ⁱ Scaliger in his Animadversiones on the words, [xxv. annis ejusdem urbis Episcopum perseverat] p. 189, s. 18. "Adjecit, non ab Hieronymo, et ab eodem repetitur in Catalogo Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum. Græcæ enim non habent."

of Eusebius's Chronicon is in Latin—not Greek—and is attributed, justly, to St. Jerome; but St. Jerome in his preface to his work, does not pretend that it is an accurate translation^h from Eusebius, or taken exclusively from him, but admits freely that he added many things from other sources, which Eusebius had not noticed, "*especially about Roman affairs*," which, he says, Eusebius seems to have only slightly alluded to, as being unimportant to the eastern nations for whom he wrote. * * "From the Trojan war, for instance," says he, "to the twentieth of Constantine, I have appended and interpolated many things (nunc addita nunc mixta sunt plurima), which I took from Tranquillus and other historians of distinction."

Who this Tranquillus was, or who were the other nameless historians from whom Jerome derived his statements about Roman affairs, which Eusebius omitted in his Chronicon, we do not profess to know; but it is obvious that the passage we have given about the twenty-five years' incumbency of St. Peter can be of no higher authority than those unknown writers, unless the mere fact that so eminent a writer as St. Jerome introduced it into his work can be considered in itself enough to render it deserving of credit.

What, then, is thought by the learned as to the accuracy of Jerome's Chronicon? for, to call it Eusebius's, after what we have said, would be a palpable misnomer.

Scaliger, who devoted so much time and labour to the vain endeavour to recover the Greek text, says—"Never did any work come to our hands blotted over with so many extensive corrections, overspread with so many inaccuracies, and so marvellously corrupt, as are the MSS. of this Latin Chronicon of Jerome's."

Father Ceillier says St. Jerome translated into Latin these two chronological books of Eusebius; but he took so much liberty in adding to it what he conceived necessary, that we may say he made of it a new book. All the Latin writers who succeeded Jerome made use of his labours; but confining themselves only to the second part. The first part of this Latin work was so much neglected that it no longer exists, but in a very imperfect state. Even in the second there are many errors; whether they originated with Eusebius himself, or with those who transcribed his MSS., or with his translator, Jerome. The first had its errors also, &c.ⁱ

Father Tillemont makes the same remarks as Ceillier: "St. Jerome translated Eusebius's Chronicon into Latin; or, rather, he has converted it into a new work." And again—"Every one acknowledges that there are a great many errors in what we have nowadays as Eusebius's Chronicon by St. Jerome, whether through the negligence of Eusebius himself, or of his copyists, to whom Dodwell attributes all the discrepancies that we find between his Latin work and the History."^j

Cardinal Baronius, in his Annals (A.D. 325, paragraphs cccxiii., cccxiv., and cccv.), also complains that the errors and corruptions of this Latin work are exceedingly great, and says that it occasioned him a greater amount of labour than almost any other ecclesiastical record, through the negligence of the transcribers, who, being wearied out with the diversities of numbers, lines, and letters of different sizes and colours, manifestly altered it, even in form, from what it originally must have been when it came from the hands of Jerome.^k

So many different readings of this much controverted passage are to be found, even in the various printed editions, to say nothing of the manuscripts, that we find some difficulty in presenting it to our readers, as we have already stated, even in Latin. The original Greek of Eusebius is, as already stated, long since lost.

Joseph Scaliger, whose learned labours we have already alluded to, gives the passage as follows:

"Petrus Apostolus quum primus Antiochenam Ecclesiam fundasset, Romam mittitur ubi Evangelium prædicans xxv. annis ejusdem urbis Episcopus perseverat." Thea. Euseb. Pamphili Chronicon. Joseph Scaliger, Amsterdam, 1658.

Other editions, such as that of Basle in 1529, and that contained in St. Jerome's works of Venice, 1769, render it thus: "Petrus Apostolus natione Galilæus Christianorum Pontifex primus, cum primum Antiochenam ecclesiam

^a Sciendum etenim me esse et interpretis et scriptoris ex parte officio usque: qui et Græcæ fidelissimè expressi et nonnullis quæ mihi intermissa esse videbantur adjecei, in Romanam maximè historiam, quam Eusebius hujus conditor libri, non tam ignorasse, utpote eruditissimus quædam Græcæ scribens parum sua necessarium perstrinxisse mihi videtur.—Prolog. ad Chronic., p. 2.

^b Il y a beaucoup de fautes dans la seconde partie que nous appelons la Chronique soit qu'elles viennent de l'auteur même soit de la part des copistes ou du traducteur.—Ceillier's History, Gen. tom. iv. p. 225.—Paris, 1733.

^c Tillemont Mémoires, pour l'Hist. Eccl., tom. vii., p. 61.—Paris, 1766.

^d Put in his sane nobis magnopere insudandum, quod Hieronymi lucubrations, librorum magnitudine, non in omnibus integræ atque æquæ, ut ab ipso elaborate nobis sunt redditæ—ut qui ista exactius non consideret, et plane accidit (quod ipse ait, cum præfatur in Eusebii Chronicon) ad vitia librorum ad auctorem facile referantur. * * * Quam vero diversum sit Eusebii ac Hieronymi Chronicon, quod habetur typis excusum, vel scriptum in antiquis codicibus, nemo non videt; ut plane apparet, librorum peritosis ejusmodi hæc et litterarum distinctionem et colorum varietates, in aliam ac plane diversam redegeisse formam, Eusebii, atque Hieronymi Chronicon, &c.—Annales, tom. iv., p. 159, Lucæ 1739.

^e The five words in Italics here are clearly interpolated, and printed so in several editions to distinguish them from the context.

fundasset, Romanum proficiat, ubi Evangelium prædicans XXV. annis ejusdem urbis Episcopos perseverat."

While the more recent edition of Venice, 1818, which also gives an Armenian version, stated to date as of the 5th century, renders it as follows, 2 part, p. 269:—Petrus Apostolus cum primis Antiochenam Ecclesiam fundasset Romanorum urbem proficiat, ibique Evangelium prædicat et commoratur illic Antistes Ecclesiæ annis viginti (quinque).

After all we have said, we suppose few of our readers will be disposed to take any important historical fact on the uncorroborated testimony of a passage from Jerome's Chronicon.

If any further evidence were wanting to corroborate the position that no such statement ever existed in the original Chronicon of Eusebius; or, that if there was, Eusebius afterwards rejected it as uncertain, it might be found in what follows.

We have already stated that the Chronicon was written by Eusebius before his History. The History is, in fact, the more copious and correct work, which Eusebius subsequently drew up from the materials set down by date in the Chronicon; yet there is not in his History any such statement as is supposed to have been taken from the Chronicon by St. Jerome about the twenty-five years, or St. Peter ever having been Bishop of Rome. Even, therefore, if the Chronicon had contained such a statement, its not having been repeated in the History would alone show that it was not to be depended on, and either that Eusebius had discovered it to be doubtful or false, after having written it in the Chronicon, or that it was the mere interpolation of some copyists. Father Ceillier (vol. iv., p. 356-7) says—"Eusebius had already written a history of the Church in his Chronicon, but it was too short in that work. * * * He, therefore, undertook the task again, to make a more copious and more accurate one. Eusebius has incorporated in one work all those detached statements of the Chronicon, and has left us a complete history of what occurred most important in the Church during nearly 325 years. * * * Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, who wrote the history of the Church after Eusebius, saw that there was nothing more to add to what he had written, and so began where he left off."

We ought not, however, finally to leave this subject without stating that although Eusebius says nothing about the 25 years, or of St. Peter having been Bishop of Rome at all, he does say in Lib. ii., ch. 14 (after giving an account, taken from Justin Martyr and others, of Simon Magus coming to Rome, and having so far prevailed as to have a statue erected to him on an island in the Tiber, between the two bridges, with the inscription to "Simon, the Holy God"), that "in the reign of Claudius the providence of God led St. Peter to Rome against this pest of mankind," though he does not say in what year he came there.

Having thus shown of how little real weight this supposed extract from the lost Chronicon of Eusebius is, we may, perhaps, safely leave the matter to the candid judgment of our impartial readers.

To do justice, however, to St. Jerome, we ought not to overlook what he himself tells us in his preface to the Chronicon. After alluding to the difficulty he experienced in translating it from Greek into Latin, he adds—"I must, therefore, beg of you to read as friends, and not as critics, whatever inaccuracies you find, especially as I have dictated the work to an amanuensis, and, as you know, with very great rapidity." Scaliger, observing on this, says, in his Prolegomena to this work of St. Jerome's—"It seems that when Jerome was dictating the translation of Eusebius's Chronicon, his attention was divided at the same moment between his amanuensis and the writing of other things; so that this distinguished man necessarily made blunders, as any one else would have done in such a case."

We have still to say a few words as to what is called the Liberian, or old Roman Catalogue, which was first, we believe, brought to light by Cuspinian, and published by Father Bucher in 1634, and afterwards by Father Henschenius in the Acta Sanctorum in 1679. What is the credit due to it, it would be difficult to ascertain; but even Bucher himself admits it is not free from blunders, especially in describing the periods of the earliest Pontiffs; and the learned Cave² has proved it to be full of the grossest

¹ We are aware that some writers have disputed the correctness of the translation (ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥώμην), as not meaning going to Rome, but we must in candour admit, that though it might have been more correct Greek to have said ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης, to denote going to Rome, we cannot adopt the view which would translate the words "against Rome," not only because we think it an unnatural and forced construction, but because the verb χεῖραγωγεῖ, "leads by the hand," seems to denote a personal removal of St. Peter to Rome, to say nothing of the τὸ κληρύμα εὐαγγελίζομενος in the close of the sentence, which we do not think could be fairly interpreted of merely sending a book called the κληρύμα πύργου to Rome, though we do not doubt that such a work really had existence at the time, as Eusebius elsewhere (L. iii. 3), alludes to it as a book τὸ βιβλίον τε λεγόμενον αὐτοῦ κληρύμα.

² "Itaque, mi Vicenti carissime, et tu Galliene, obsecro, ut quicquid hoc tumultuarii operis est, amicum, non iudicum animo releatis; præsertim cum et notario, ut scitis, velocissime dictaverim."—Prolog. ad Chron. p. 3.

³ Catalogus Pontificum Romanorum. Ægidii Bucherii, Commentarius de doctrina temporum. Antw., 1634, p. 269. "Mendis non carum, fateror, tam in Consulibus quam in spatis Pontificum, maxime priorum, defindenda."—p. 278.

⁴ Historia Lit. tom. II.; Sæculum Apost. p. 7, sec. 2. Lond., 1698.

blunders of the transcriber. For instance, it places Cletus and Anacletus as two distinct persons, and both after Clement; and assigns, contrary to every historical record, an exact number of years, months, and days to each, viz., Cletus and Anacletus, with just as great particularity as we have seen it does in the case of St. Peter. Dodwell, we may observe, refers it to the 6th century, and even if it had been preserved in its original state, which there is no reason to believe it has, no one pretends that it dates earlier than the latter part of the 4th century.

We need scarcely add that all the arguments we have already adduced to prove the incorrectness of the statement in St. Jerome's Chronicon, are equally applicable to the passage in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical writers, in which he repeats the statement in his Chronicon, and that they also show that Bucher's Catalogue is unworthy of credit in treating St. Peter as 25 years, one month, and nine days Bishop of Rome.

We might greatly strengthen our case by going into the absurd story of Simon Magus and his fiery chariot, which was ultimately worked up into the Golden Legend by Jacobus de Voragine in the 13th century, and which we have already given some account of in a former volume (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., p. 97), but for the present we must forbear doing so, merely adding that the earliest writer who mentions Simon Magus and his statue between the two bridges of the Tiber was Justin Martyr, who makes no mention whatever of St. Peter having come to Rome to combat with him; but, on the contrary, speaks of his statue as still there in his time, and ends the narrative by earnestly praying that it should be taken down.¹

St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, also speaks of Simon Magus' but asserts that he was destroyed by the prayers of both Peter and Paul, both of whom he treats as personally present, which, if it be true, establishes beyond dispute that the visit of Peter in the reign of Claudius, and his 25 years' bishopric, was a fiction or an error, as no one ever pretended that St. Paul went to Rome before the reign of Nero.

We pause here for the present, fearing that the patience of our readers may not quite keep pace with our industry.

It is, however, not a matter of light moment either to the cause of historical truth or sound theology, that erroneous records should be allowed to pass for true under the sanction of great names, and we wished to relieve our present subject of all difficulty of that kind, before proceeding to the next step in the chain of our argument against the Supremacy of the Church of Rome.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have several letters in type which we have been obliged to postpone, from want of space. We hope our friends will excuse us for not noticing them more particularly.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street. Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

ERRATUM.—In our last number, at foot of col. 1, p. 85, expunge quotation from St. Jerome: the correct reading is, *errant*, instead of *erant*, which obviously alters the meaning of the whole passage.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, SEPTEMBER 18, 1856.

THE coronation of statues of the Virgin, and adulation of the reigning Pope, seem to be the order of the day in France.

We have lately called the attention of our readers to the coronation of "our Lady of Laus," in the Diocese of Gap, and the solemn benediction of the statue of Notre Dame de Myans, near Chambéry, in Savoy.

We have since learned, from a recent "mandement" of the Bishop of Puy, in France, that the ancient image of "our Lady of Puy" is also about to be crowned, under the sanction of the Holy See.

¹ Statuam, si ita vobis placet, deicite. Justin Martyr. Apologia I., s. 56, p. 77. Ben. Ed., 1742. We might make the same observation of St. Irenæus. Adv. Hæres. l. 1, c. 20, p. 115.

² Cum vero error se latius spargeret, vitium illud correxit egregium par virorum, Petrus et Paulus ecclesiæ præsulibus illuc appaui (παράγονόμνοι); Simoneque, illum videlicet opinione Deum, superbe se ostentantem subita morte perculerunt. Nam cum pollicitus esset Simon se sublimem in colos elatum iri, ac demonum vehiculo sublatum per aera ferretur, genibus provoluti Servi Dei, concordiam illam demonstrantes, de qua Jesus dixerat. "Si duo ex vobis concordarint, de omni re quæcumque petierint, fiet eis;" concordie telo per precationem adversus magum immissio, præcipientem ad terram deiecerunt.—Cyril. Hieros. Opera. Ben. Ed. 1730. Catech. vi. s. 18, p. 95.

³ Our readers have already learned from our pages that this image is black, and was pronounced by Faujas de St. Fond, who examined it minutely in 1777, to be an Egyptian statue.

"To adorn the image of their august patroness with a splendid diadem," says the Bishop, "the pious congregations of the Holy Virgin have spoiled themselves, some of their diamonds, others of their precious jewels; these of their rings and ear-rings, those of their bracelets; a great number of the fruits of their savings: all have sent their offerings, &c." "This coronation," he continues, "will excite your joy and transports. We are about to consecrate solemnly the royalty of her whom you have learned to love, to praise, to venerate, from your very cradle. We are going to enhance her glory, who constitutes the honour, the joy, the hope, the life, almost of our episcopal city—of our entire diocese. We are about to adorn the august and sacred brow of her who, from the height of this holy mountain, protects your lives and your property, extends her tutelary hands over your towns and your fields, and blesses and renders fruitful your labours and your industry. Come, then, come quickly, run in crowds, fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, young men of piety, and chaste and modest maidens; and, above all, ye priests, our well-beloved fellow-labourers, charged, as well as we ourselves, with the duty of preserving and extending their lively and tender devotion to the Mother of God, which has always distinguished this beautiful diocese which Heaven has confided to our pastoral crook. Good inhabitants of Velay, PEOPLE OF MARY, we are assured that, on this occasion more than ever, you will evince the sentiments which animate you, and with which you will be nourished during the months consecrated to the Queen of Heaven. The holy father has extended the plenary indulgence granted for several centuries past to those who frequent this pilgrimage to each of the days of the octave of the Assumption, &c."

The above extract, from the *Univers*, affords a new proof that devotion to Mary has become one of the characteristic features in the ultramontane system of modern Rome.

We also learn from the *Univers* of 30th August last that the present Pontiff, Pope Pius IX. (who never loses an opportunity of encouraging the worship of Mary), has just granted to the city of Lyons, by a bull dated 29th July last, a plenary indulgence on the occasion of the feast of the Nativity of the Holy Virgin. The following is a translation:—

"PIUS IX., POPE. IN PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

"It has been reported to us, that a custom has already existed for a long time in the city of Lyons that, in commemoration of the sensible protection of the Virgin Mother of God, of which this town has experienced the effects, a solemn benediction, of which the ceremony is renewed every year, should be given from the top of the hill of Fourviers, in presence of the people, on the day of the fête of the nativity of the same blessed immaculate Virgin Mary, by which means the whole city is recommended to the patronage of the Mother of God. And, as it is admitted that a greater abundance of benefits would accrue to the faithful if their piety were fortified by our apostolical authority, with some assistance towards their eternal salvation, and being desirous that we may not appear wanting in anything that might be for the good of the souls which we have the intention of saving, as far as in our power, in the Lord, and accepting with good will the prayers which have been presented to us for that purpose: Now we, by the mercy of God, and the authority of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, do hereby grant a plenary indulgence and the remission of all their sins to all and every of the faithful in Christ, of either sex, who shall be present, with piety, at the above recited ceremony, provided that, being truly penitent, and having confessed, and been strengthened by the Holy Communion, they devoutly visit on that day their respective parish churches or the sanctuary of Fourviers, and address there to God fervent prayers for the concord of Christian princes, the extinction of heresies, and the exaltation of Holy Mother Church, which indulgence they may apply also by the way of suffrage to the souls departed in the faith of Christ, and united to God by charity. And we hereby direct that these presents shall take effect, but during ten years only, all clauses to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding. Given at Rome, at St. Marie Majeure, under the ring of the Fisherman, the 29th July, 1856, and 11th year of our Pontificate.

Signed by Monsigneur Cardinal Macchi.

L. ✕ S. J. B. BRANCALONI CASTELLANI, Sub.

Our readers will remark that the *extirpation of heresies and the exaltation of the Church* seem to be among the uppermost ideas in the mind of the Pontiff; and we confess we are rather surprised to find that such paramount objects should not have called into existence a somewhat more liberal grant than a stingy *ten years' lease* only! Possibly, his Holiness does not feel very sure of the continued fidelity of the good city of Lyons, and therefore thinks it wiser not to commit himself by too lavish or permanent a distribution of the *spiritual* benefits of